



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

h

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,202	04/21/2004	Hsien-Chin Chiang	WISP0048USA	3201

27765 7590 03/03/2005

NORTH AMERICA INTERNATIONAL PATENT OFFICE (NAIPC)
P.O. BOX 506
MERRIFIELD, VA 22116

EXAMINER

BROUSSARD, COREY M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2835

DATE MAILED: 03/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/709,202	Applicant(s) CHIANG ET AL.	
	Examiner Corey M. Broussard	Art Unit 2835	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claims contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The claimed limitation of "... the heat sink module capable of drawing air..." in both claims is not supported by the specification. The word "drawing" seems to be used in a way that states the heat sink in of itself is collecting or otherwise exerting some motive force on the air. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2835

4. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitlas et al. With respect to claim 1, Kitlas teaches a cooling module of a computer system comprising: a fan module (12) with an air inlet and an air outlet, capable of drawing air into the air inlet and exhausting air from the air outlet (see Fig. 10, air flows 104, 106); a heat sink module (14) with an air inlet (15), an air outlet (17), and a heat conduction part (col 3, lines 8-10 disclose cooling fins within 16); the heat conduction part being between the air inlet and the air outlet, the air outlet connecting to the air inlet of the fan module (see Fig. 1), the heat conduction part connecting to a circuit of the computer system (14 is a CPU module, col 3 lines 8-10); the air is drawn through the heat sink module into the air inlet and through the heat conduction part and exhausting air from the air outlet; and an air wall (11) between the air inlet of the fan module and air inlet of the heat sink module for isolating airflow from the air inlet of the heat sink module to the air outlet of the fan module, so that heated air from the air outlet of the fan module is prevented from flowing into the air inlet of the heat sink module (see Fig. 10). Kitlas lacks where the air wall prevents heated air from the air outlet of the heat sink module from flowing into the air inlet of the fan module. It has been held that a mere reversal of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. In re Gazda 104 USPQ 400 (CCPA 1955) It would have been obvious to a person or ordinary skill in the art to reverse the fan module so that air was drawn into the case and into the CPU module at element 17 for the benefit of having fresh cooler air pass through the heat conduction part instead of air already warmed by the other components in the case thereby improving the CPU cooling ability of the device.

5. With respect to claim 2, Kitlas teaches wherein the air wall (11) further comprises an approach (52); one end of the approach connecting to the air inlet of the fan module (12) while another end connects to the air outlet (17) of the heat sink module (14, see Fig. 1, 2). Kitlas lacks where the approach is connecting the air outlet of the fan module to the air inlet of the heat sink module. It has been held that a mere reversal of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. In re Gazda 104 USPQ 400 (CCPA 1955) It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to reverse the fan module so that air was drawn into the case and into the CPU module at element 17 for the benefit of having fresh cooler air pass through the heat conduction part instead of air already warmed by the other components in the case thereby improving the CPU cooling ability of the device.

6. With respect to claim 3, Kitlas teaches wherein the computer system and the cooling module (10) are disposed within a case (24, see Fig. 1).

7. With respect to claim 4, Kitlas teaches a brace (13) in the case; the air wall (11) being fixed to the brace (see Fig. 2).

8. With respect to claim 5, Kitlas teaches wherein a support device (18) of the computer system is capable of being fixed to the brace (via 20, 22, see col 3, lines 66-67 and col 4 lines 1-2).

9. With respect to claim 6, Kitlas teaches wherein the air wall (11) comprises at least one connection end while the brace (13) comprises a corresponding connection end; the connection end of the air wall capable of plugging into the connection end of the brace (see Fig. 4).

Art Unit: 2835

10. With respect to claim 7, Kitlas teaches wherein the air wall divides the case into a first room and a second room (see Fig. 10, the area contained by 14 and 11 make up the first room, and the remaining area contained in the case 24 is the second room), so that the fan module (12) draws air into the first room, and the heat sink module (14) exhausts air from the second room. Kitlas lacks where the heat sink module exhausts air into the second room. It has been held that a mere reversal of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. In re Gazda 104 USPQ 400 (CCPA 1955) It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to reverse the fan module so that air was drawn into the case and into the CPU module at element 17 for the benefit of having fresh cooler air pass through the heat conduction part instead of air already warmed by the other components in the case thereby improving the CPU cooling ability of the device.

11. With respect to claim 8, Kitlas teaches a second fan module (90) in the case (24) for drawing air provided into the second room from outside the case. Kitlas lacks where the second fan module exhausts air outside of the case. It has been held that a mere reversal of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. In re Gazda 104 USPQ 400 (CCPA 1955) It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to reverse the fan module so that air was drawn into the case and into the CPU module at element 17 for the benefit of having fresh cooler air pass through the heat conduction part instead of air already warmed by the other components in the case thereby improving the CPU cooling ability of the device.

Art Unit: 2835

12. With respect to claim 9, Kitlas teaches wherein the heat conduction part is connected to a central processing unit of the computer system (see col 3, lines 8-10).

13. With respect to claim 10, Kitlas teaches a case (24); a circuit for controlling operations of the computer system (CPU circuit is inside 14 see col 3, lines 8-10); and a cooling module (10) in the case comprising: a fan module (12) with an air inlet and an air outlet, capable of drawing air into the air inlet and exhausting air from the air outlet (see Fig. 10); a heat sink module (14) with an air inlet (15), an air outlet (17), and a heat conduction part (col 3, lines 8-10 disclose cooling fins within 16); the heat conduction part being between the air inlet and the air outlet, the air outlet connecting to the air inlet of the fan module, the heat conduction part connecting to the circuit; air is drawn into the air inlet of the heat sink module and through the heat conduction part and exhausting air from the air outlet; and an air wall (11) between the air inlet of the fan module and the air inlet of the heat sink module for isolating air flow from the air inlet of the heat sink module to the air outlet of the fan module, so that heated air from the air outlet of the fan module is prevented from flowing into the air inlet of the heat sink module. Kitlas lacks where air from the outlet of the heat sink module is prevented from flowing into the air inlet of the fan module. It has been held that a mere reversal of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. In re Gazda 104 USPQ 400 (CCPA 1955) It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to reverse the fan module so that air was drawn into the case and into the CPU module at element 17 for the benefit of having fresh cooler air pass through the heat

Art Unit: 2835

conduction part instead of air already warmed by the other components in the case thereby improving the CPU cooling ability of the device.

14. With respect to claim 11, Kitlas teaches wherein the air wall (11) further comprises an approach (52); one end of the approach connecting to the air inlet of the fan module while another end connects to the air outlet of the heat sink module (see Fig. 1, 2). Kitlas lacks where the approach connects the air outlet of the fan module to the air inlet of the heat sink module. It has been held that a mere reversal of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. In re Gazda 104 USPQ 400 (CCPA 1955) It would have been obvious to a person or ordinary skill in the art to reverse the fan module so that air was drawn into the case and into the CPU module at element 17 for the benefit of having fresh cooler air pass through the heat conduction part instead of air already warmed by the other components in the case thereby improving the CPU cooling ability of the device.

15. With respect to claim 12, Kitlas teaches a brace (13) in the case (24); the air wall (11) being fixed to the brace (see Fig. 1-4).

16. With respect to claim 13, Kitlas teaches a support device (18) fixed to the brace (13) for supporting operations of the computer system.

17. With respect to claim 14, Kitlas teaches wherein the air wall (11) comprises at least one connection end while the brace (13) comprises a corresponding connection end; the connection end of the air wall capable of plugging into the connection end of the brace (see Fig. 4).

18. With respect to claim 15, Kitlas teaches wherein the air wall (11) divides the case into a first room and a second room (see Fig. 10, the area contained by 14 and 11 make up the first room, and the remaining area contained in the case 24 is the second room), so that the fan module (12) draws air into the first room, and the heat sink module (14) exhausts air from the second room. Kitlas lacks where the heat sink module exhausts air into the second room. It has been held that a mere reversal of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. In re Gazda 104 USPQ 400 (CCPA 1955) It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to reverse the fan module so that air was drawn into the case and into the CPU module at element 17 for the benefit of having fresh cooler air pass through the heat conduction part instead of air already warmed by the other components in the case thereby improving the CPU cooling ability of the device.

19. With respect to claim 16, Kitlas teaches a second fan module (90) in the case (24) for drawing air provided into the second room from outside the case. Kitlas lacks where the second fan module exhausts air outside of the case. It has been held that a mere reversal of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. In re Gazda 104 USPQ 400 (CCPA 1955) It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to reverse the fan module so that air was drawn into the case and into the CPU module at element 17 for the benefit of having fresh cooler air pass through the heat conduction part instead of air already warmed by the other components in the case thereby improving the CPU cooling ability of the device.

Art Unit: 2835

20. With respect to claim 17, Kitlas teaches wherein the circuit (circuit inside 14) is a central processing unit of the computer system (see col 3, lines 8-10).

Conclusion

21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Viallet (PN 5,917,698), Swensen et al. (PN 4,644,443), and Rumbaugh (PN 4,122,508) demonstrating the general state of the art of air walled cases.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Corey M. Broussard whose telephone number is 571 272 2799. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn Feild can be reached on 571 272 2092. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CMB


LYNN FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800